

Application No. 10/700,083
Amendment Dated March 4, 2010
Reply to Office Action Dated September 4, 2009

Remarks

Claims 1-36 are pending.

Claims 1-36 stand rejected.

Claims 1-36 are submitted herein for review.

There are no amendments and No new matter has been added.

In the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1-36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over the previously cited Ng et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,131,096). Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner and submit the following remarks in response.

The present independent claim 1 is directed to a method for use in a first device, to configure a second device to perform data synchronization with the first device. The method includes transmitting to the second device, from a first device instructions for generating a web-based user interface on the second device, the web-based user interface for use on the second device being the same interface as used on the first device.

The user interface is programmed to elicit from a user at the second device information identifying a personal information manager (PIM) used on the second device, and to transmit the information to the first device via the communication connection.

The second device is provided a synchronization package based on the PIM-identifying information including a synchronization application, where the synchronization application is installed on the second device to be utilized via the web-

based user interface. The web-based user interface is programmed to elicit from the user synchronization information regarding data to be synchronized, and to provide the synchronization information to the synchronization application installed on the second device from the first device.

In the background section of the present application a specific problem is highlighted regarding how prior art synchronization is carried out.

[0005] "Referring to FIG. 1B, a prior art configuration of a PIM device (e.g., user's PC 100) to prepare it for the synchronization process involves the user first logging onto the web-based server's website to access prior art web application 205. (A web application is a software application that is accessible from the Internet.) The user then downloads a synchronization package from server 200 over the Internet 50. The synchronization package includes synchronization application 120, sync engine 110, and configuration interface 115 (the connector is also included, but is not shown). Next, the user exits server 200 and installs the synchronization package components on PC 100. Once the synchronization package components are installed, the user configures synchronization application 120 using configuration interface 115. Configuration includes informing the synchronization application of the user's account name and password for server 200, which items (calendar, address book, e-mail, etc.) the user wants to synchronize to user's PC 100, which PIM 160, e.g., Microsoft Outlook, the user has installed on PC 100, the locations on PC 100 of the PIM's address book, calendar, and e-mail folders, which direction to synchronize the data, e.g., bidirectionally between server 200 and PC 100, and on what schedule synchronization should occur, e.g., once per day, once per week, etc. Once this configuration is completed, configuration interface 115 is no longer needed. Then, based on the synchronization schedule, synchronization application 120 uses the user's account number and password to log on to web server 200 and prior art web application 205 via the Internet 50 and uses sync engine 110 to synchronize server database 220 on web server 200 with PIM database 170 on PC 100. This process is currently used to configure synchronization between, e.g., a user's PDA or PC and data stored in a web-based server account, such as Yahoo!TM, or MSNTM."

It is Applicants understanding that this description is akin to the synchronization

arrangement of the Ng prior art reference cited by the Examiner.

However, such arrangements has a particular drawback. For example, paragraph [0006] of the present application states:

[0006] “The prior art configuration process has several disadvantages. *First, a user must confront two completely different interfaces: a web-based interface, in order to create contacts and calendar folders on the server side and to interact with prior art web application 205 to download the synchronization package, and then a Windows-based interface, in order to install the synchronization components and to configure synchronization application 120.* Second, many of the steps to configure a folder for synchronization are complicated and must be performed in the proper sequence. Third, some of the steps used in configuring synchronization application 120 are repeated when accessing prior art web application 205. In all, this configuration process can be very tedious and confusing.” (emphasis added)

The presently claimed arrangement addresses this by simplifying the process to a user by using a single (style) interface. For example, as noted in paragraph [0012]:

[0012] “Advantageously, the invention allows the web-based user interface to present the settings used to configure the user-side synchronization application, and thus presents to the user only one interface for configuration rather than two as in the prior art.”

This is illustrated in greater detail for example in the detailed description in paragraph [0030] which states:

[0030] “Screen shot 420 in FIG. 4A illustrates steps 330 and 340. Step 330 asks the user which PIM the user has on the device. Choices here may be Microsoft Outlook, Outlook Express, Lotus Notes, Palm OS, Palm Desktop, or other PIMs. The user indicates to user interface 150 the appropriate PIM. Alternatively, user interface 150 may be set up to recognize the PIM used on the device by detecting settings on the user's device. This PIM-identifying information is transmitted to server 200, which then downloads a synchronization package to the user's device in step 340, and user interface 150 installs the synchronization package on

the user's device. The major components of the synchronization package are sync engine 110, synchronization application 120, and a connector application, which is specific for the chosen PIM, but no configuration interface is downloaded. These actions are similar to those performed in the prior art, but here the user merely performs one step, indicating to user interface 150 the PIM loaded on the device, and the user interface, interacting with JavaScript layer 140 and COM interface 130, takes care of the rest of the installation and configuration activity. User interface 150 determines that the PIM information is to be transmitted to server 200 and the synchronization package is to be downloaded to the user's device and then installed on the user's device. ***In the prior art, the user performed multiple steps, exiting the web-based interface and separately installing the synchronization package and configuring the synchronization application with no help from the prior art web-based interface or web application.***” (emphasis added)

The Examiner, in forming the rejection states that Ng teaches the element that “...the web-based user interface for use on the second device being the same interface as used on the first device...” is shown in column 6, lines 6-15 of Ng. Although these sections do describe a user interface 305 for downloadable 145, it does not suggest that it is the same interface, such as that presumably included in web server 140, that is used on the first device (global server 105).

In the response to arguments section, the Examiner states that “Applicant alleges Ng fails to disclose the claimed invention because Ng does not teach generating a web-based interface on the second device. The Examiner disagrees. Ng clearly teaches using a browser based applets or plug-ins to generate PIM interface on the second device (see col. 4, lines 33-34).”

Applicants submit that it is not necessarily that Ng does not teach generating a web-based interface on the second device but rather that the web-based user interface for use on the second device ***is the same interface as used on the first device.***

Application No. 10/700,083
Amendment Dated March 4, 2010
Reply to Office Action Dated September 4, 2009

As such Applicants respectfully submit that the Ng reference does not teach or suggest all of the elements of the independent claims. For example, there is no teaching or suggestion in Ng that discloses, transmitting to the second device from a first device, instructions for generating a web-based user interface on the second device, the web-based user interface for use on the second device *being the same interface as used on the first device*.

For at least this reason, Applicants request that the rejection of independent claims 1, 16 and 22 be withdrawn. Also, as claims 2-15, 17-21 and 23-36 depend from these claims, the rejection of these claims should be withdrawn for at least the same reasons.

In view of the foregoing Applicants respectfully submit that pending claims 1-36 are in condition for allowance, the earliest possible notice of which is earnestly solicited. If the Examiner feels that an interview would facilitate the prosecution of this Application they are invited to contact the undersigned at the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,
SOFER & HAROUN, L.L.P.

By /Joseph Sofer/
Joseph Sofer
Reg. No 34,438
317 Madison Avenue
Suite 910
New York, NY 10017
(212) 697-2800
Customer # 39600

Dated: March 4, 2010